REMARKS

Claims 1-5, 8 and 9 remain pending in the present application. Claims 6 and 7 have been cancelled. Claim 1 has been amended. Basis for the amendments can be found throughout the specification, claims and drawings as originally filed.

PRIORITY

Applicant has amended the specification to reflect the claim to priority that was made at the time of filing the application.

DRAWINGS

The drawings are objected to. The drawings have been amended to change reference numeral 60 to 26 in Figure 1.

CLAIM OBJECTION

Claim 1 is objected to because the word "and" should be inserted at the end of line
4. Claim 1 has been amended to overcome the objection. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Maxey, (U.S. Pat. No. 3,171,699). Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Harrison, (U.S. Pat. No. 3,239, 286). Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Stevenson et al, (U.S. Pat. No. 5,820,115) (Stevenson). Claims 1 & 3-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Polster et al, (U.S. Pat. No. 5,746,673) (Polster).

Claim 1 has been amended to have the inner member define an outer surface and an end surface. The elastomeric member slidingly engages both of these surfaces. The outer member includes a first portion disposed opposite to the outer surface and a second portion opposite to the end surface. This structure is illustrated in Figure 3.

None of the four references cited by the Examiner, (Maxey, Harrison, Stevenson et al., Polster et al.) disclose, teach or even suggest the structure that is now claimed in amended Claim 1 of the present invention.

Thus, applicant believes Claim 1, as amended, patentably distinguishes over the art of record. Likewise, Claims 2-5 which ultimately depend from Claim 1 are also believed to patentably distinguish over the art of record. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

REJOINDER

Applicant respectfully requests rejoinder of Claims 6 and 7.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the

Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: Oct 8, 2003

. y.

Michael J. Schmidt, 34,007

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C. P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303 (248) 641-1600

MJS/pmg